DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 052 756 HE 002 446

AUTHOR	Shaw, Biswanath
TITLE	Academic Tenure Policies and Procedures.
INSTITUTION	Rust Coll., Holly Springs, Miss.
PUB DATE	25 Sep 70
NOTE	26p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrative Policy, *College Faculty, *Faculty, Higher Education, Land Grant Universities, *State Universities, *Tenure
IDENTIFIERS	National Assoc State Universities Land Grant Coll

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to determine the policies for the acquisition and termination of academic tenure and the procedures used to implement these policies in the member institutions of the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges (NASULGC). The study was also designed to present and analyze data related to the number and percentage of tenured faculty during 1969-70, tenure termination proceedings, and causes of tenure terminations during the period 1958 to 1968. The head of each of the 106 member institutions was requested to send copies of institutional documents concerning tenure policies and procedures. Eighty institutions (76 percent) sent the documents that were subsequently subjected to a content analysis. They were also requested to fill out a questionnaire that elicited data on tenured faculty and tenure termination. Sixty institutions (57 percent) responded to the questionnaire. This report presents separately the findings based on the institutional documents and on the questionnaires. Recommendations are presented along with a suggested format for a statement on academic tenure policies and procedures and a list of the institutions that participated in the study. (AF)

ED052756

ACADEMIC TENURE

POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

By Biswanath Shaw

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

HE002446

RUST COLLEGE

Holly Springs, Mississippi

PREFACE

This is a summary of the study entitled Academic Tenure Policies and Procedures in State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges Which Are Members of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges. The study was conducted as a doctoral dissertation project at the University of Mississippi during 1969-70.

The writer wishes to express his sincere appreciation to Dr. John R. Fawcett, Jr. who served as the director of the research project for his valuable guidance, help, and inspiration.

His sincere thanks are due to Dr. Robert B. Ellis and Dr. Douglas McDonald, members of the dissertation committee, for their helpful suggestions, guidance, and encouragement.

The writer also wishes to express his appreciation to the heads and administrative officers of ninety-one state universities and land-grant institutions whose cooperation has made the study possible.

September 25, 1970 — Biswanath Shaw

INTRODUCTION

Academic freedom in an institution of higher learning is essential to the free search for truth and its exposition. Tenure is a means to acquire, to preserve, and to protect academic freedom. Byse and Joughin stated: "This principal justification for academic tenure is that it enables a faculty member to teach, study and act free from a large number of restraints and pressures which otherwise would inhibit thought and action."[1] Tenure policies and procedures vary considerably from institution to institution. Dressel emphasized this by saying: "Ideally every institution would develop its own tenure policies on the basis of its particular philosophy; however, it is somewhat reassuring to an institution to know that its tenure policies are consistent with those of other institutions with which it must compete for faculty."[2]

THE PROBLEM

The purpose of this study was to determine the policies for the acquisition and termination of academic tenure and the procedures used to implement these policies in state universities and land-grant institutions which are members of the National Association of State

---

[1] Clark Byse and Louis Joughin, Tenure in American Higher Education (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1952), p. 2.

[2] Paul L. Dressel, "A Review of the Tenure Policies of Thirty-one Major Universities," Educational Record, XXXXIV (July, 1963), 248.

Universities and Land-Grant Colleges. The study was also designed to present and analyze data related to the number and percentage of tenured faculty during 1969-70; tenure termination proceedings, tenure termination, and causes of tenure terminations during the ten-year period preceding 1968-69. The study was made to ascertain recommendations which should be helpful to the college and university administrators, faculty, and others who are concerned with the tenure policies and procedures in institutions of higher learning.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

Woodburne considered "tenure standards" as one of the major areas of activity in the administration of colleges and universities. He stated that "the educational teaching function is the central core of a college or university whose tentacles spread very widely."[3] He further explained: "The basic educational policy decisions lend to matters of curriculum; curriculum is implemented only by the appointment of qualified faculty; faculty are stimulated to their best efforts only when co-ordination is maintained between appointments, promotions, tenure, salaries, leaves of absence, teaching loads and annuties."[4]

The author was not aware of any studies of tenure policies and procedures which specifically concern the state universities

---

[3] Lloyd S. Woodburne, Principles of College and University Administration (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1958), p. 6.

[4] Ibid., p. 7.

and land-grant institutions as a group. Executive Director Russell I. Thackery of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges wrote: "I have inquired of the American Association of University Professors if a study of tenure policies in state universities and land-grant institutions has been made. They are not aware of such a study, nor am I."[5]

The findings of this study should provide information concerning tenure policies and procedures in the participating state universities and land-grant colleges. This information should be useful to the college and university administrators and faculties in reviewing tenure plans and in considering modification of tenure policies and procedures. It should also provide data for comparative analyses of tenure policies and procedures between the institutions used in this study and other institutions of higher learning in the United States.

METHODS OF THE STUDY

The population of the study consisted of 106 of the 112 member institutions of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges. Of the 106 institutions included in the study, sixty-eight were land-grant colleges and universities, thirty-seven were separate state universities, and one was a municipal

---

[5]Personal correspondence from Russell I. Thackery, Executive Director of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, addressed to the writer.

university. Two of the land-grant institutions, Cornell University and Massachusetts Institute of Technology, were privately controlled. The institutions were distributed among all the fifty states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. Although the institutions included in the study represented fewer than 5 percent of the nation's more than 2,200 colleges and universities, they enrolled during 1968-69 nearly 30 percent of all the students enrolled in institutions of higher learning in the nation; awarded about 30 percent of all bachelor's and professional degrees, 40 percent of all master's degrees, and 60 percent of all doctoral degrees.

Two instruments were used in the study. One instrument was designed to record the data concerning tenure policies and procedures from the institutional documents by method of content analysis. Another instrument, a mail questionnaire, was designed to collect data concerning the number of the tenured faculty at various ranks during 1969-70; the number of tenure termination proceedings, dismissals, and causes of dismissals during the ten-year period preceding 1968-69.

The head of each of the 106 state universities and land-grant colleges included in the study was requested to send the writer copies of institutional documents concerning tenure policies and procedures. A questionnaire also accompained the request for institutional documents. Of the 106 state universities and land-grant colleges, eighty, or 76 percent, sent their official publications such as faculty handbooks, faculty manuals, or official statements on tenure. Sixty, or 57 percent, of the 106 state universities and land-grant colleges

returned usable questionnaires. Only one of the 106 institutions reported that the college had neither tenure policies in operation, nor any publication such as a faculty handbook or faculty manual. Forty-nine institutions were represented with both documents and usable questionnaires, thirty-one with documents only, and eleven with questionnaires only. Thus a total number of ninety-one, or 85 percent, of the 106 state universities and land-grant colleges participated in the study.

The content analysis of the documents received from the eighty participating institutions was based on inferences drawn from a systematic interpretation of the content concerning tenure policies and procedures of each institution. The data were recorded in the instrument designed for content analysis. A reliability test of the content analysis was conducted with the help of three independent analysts and the result indicated 91.8 percent of agreement between the investigator and the analysts.

The data from the sixty returned questionnaires and the eighty completed instruments for content analysis were tabulated manually in separate charts. The data were analyzed and presented in both narrative and tabular form. The findings were compared with those of the previous studies related to academic tenure in higher education as to policies and procedures for the acquisition of tenure, policies and procedures for the termination of tenure, percentage of faculty on tenure at various ranks, number of tenure termination proceedings and dismissals, and causes of dismissals.

FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

The findings of this study are divided into two groups, those which stem from the anlaysis of institutional documents received from eighty state universities and land-grant colleges, and those which stem from the questionnaire replies received from sixty state universities and land-grant colleges.

Institutional Documents

1. Definitions of tenure were provided in the institutional documents of twenty-two state universities and land-grant colleges. Tenure was described in some of these documents as a right of the faculty, while it was explained as a privilege of the teacher in some of the documents.

2. Tenure prescribed in the documents from sixty-seven state universities and land-grant colleges were classified as legal tenure, or tenure that could be legally binding on the governing board and the faculty concerned. Tenure prescribed in the documents from thirteen institutions was classified as moral tenure, or tenure with no legal status because of the prohibitive restrictions stated or implied in the documents.

3. Automatic acquisition of tenure at a particular rank and after a specified probationary period was prescribed in the documents from forty-four institutions. Evaluative tenure which could be granted at a particular rank and after a specified period, but not automatically, was prescribed in the documents from twenty-five institutions. Tenure plans of eleven institutions were not specifically explained

to indicate their automatic or evaluative classification.

4. The rank of associate professor was indicated as the pre-tenure rank in the documents from fifteen institutions. The rank of assistant professor was prescribed as the pre-tenure rank in the documents from seventeen institutions. The rank of instructor was stated as the pre-tenure rank in the documents from twenty-two institutions. No specific pre-tenure rank was indicated in the documents from six institutions.

5. Tenure was granted at any rank at fifteen state universities and land-grant colleges. Tenure was awarded at only professorial ranks at twenty-eight state universities and land-grant colleges.

6. Documents from the forty-four state universities and land-grant colleges providing automatic tenure indicated that tenure was granted at any rank at fifteen institutions, and only at professorial ranks at twenty-eight institutions. Specific rank for the award of tenure was not stated in the document from one of the forty-four institutions in this category.

7. Documents from the twenty-five state universities and land-grant colleges providing evaluative tenure indicated that tenure was awarded at any rank at five institutions and only at professorial ranks at eighteen institutions. Specific rank for the award of tenure was not indicated in the documents from two of the twenty-five institutions in this category.

8. Documents from eleven state universities and land-grant colleges providing no specific information about the nature (automatic or evaluative) of their tenure plans indicated that tenure was granted

at any rank at two institutions, and only at professorial ranks at six institutions. No specific rank for the award of tenure was indicated in the documents from three of the eleven institutions in this category.

9. Uniform probationary period for all ranks was prescribed in the documents of twenty-five of the eighty state universities and land-grant colleges. Documents from these institutions indicated that the probationary period was three years at seven institutions, four years at one institution, five years at five institutions, six years at three institutions, seven years at eight institutions, and eight years at one institution. The average duration of probationary period was 5.28 years.

10. Varying duration of probationary period according to the faculty ranks at which a teacher would normally acquire tenure was prescribed in the documents from forty-six of the eighty state universities and land-grant colleges. The probationary period for professors ranged from none to four years, the average being 2.14 years and the median being two years. The probationary period for associate professors ranged from none to seven years, the average being 3.14 years and the median being three years. Probationary period for assistant professors ranged from three to seven years, the average being 5.3 years, and the median being five years. The probationary period for instructors ranged from four to seven years, the average being 6.5 years and the median being seven years.

11. Tenure was granted to professors upon appointment at eleven state universities and land-grant colleges, after a year's probation at

two institutions, after a probationary period of two years at eight institutions, after a probationary period of three years at seventeen institutions, and after a probationary period of four years at six institutions.

12. Tenure was granted to associate professors effective the date of their initial appointment at three institutions, after a year's probation at one institution, after a probationary period of two years at five institutions, after a probationary period of three years at eighteen institutions, after a probationary period of four years at eleven institutions, after a probationary period of five years at four institutions, and after a probationary period of seven years at one institution.

13. Tenure was granted to assistant professors after a probationary period of four years at four institutions, after a probationary period of five years at fifteen institutions, after a probationary period of six years at nine institutions, and after a probationary period of seven years at nine institutions. Tenure was not granted below the rank of associate professor at nine institutions in this group.

14. Tenure was granted to instructors after a probationary period of four years at two institutions, after a probationary period of six years at three institutions, and after a probationary period of seven years at eleven institutions. Tenure was not awarded below the rank of assistant professor at thirty institutions.

15. The documents from twenty-eight state universities and land-grant colleges indicated that a faculty member's previous teaching experience at other colleges or universities was acceptable as a credit

towards his probationary period. The duration of the acceptable period varied among these twenty-eight institutions. The number of institutions accepting the number of years was as follows: one not more than one year; two not more than two years; one one year for every four years of previous experience up to a limit of four years; two five years; two one to three years; and one four to five years. Documents from two institutions did not indicate specific period acceptable.

16. An up or out policy was indicated in the institutional documents from twelve institutions. According to this policy a teacher under probation was either promoted to the higher rank at the end of the specified period, or his service was terminated. This policy was prescribed for instructors at nine institutions and for assistant professors at three institutions.

17. A tenure or out policy was stated in the institutional documents from eight institutions. According to this policy a teacher who was not tenured at the end of the probationary period was not reappointed.

18. Use of a notice of nonreappointment similar to the 1964 Statement on the Standard for Notice of Nonreappointment endorsed by the American Association of University Professors was prescribed in the documents from twenty-one state universities and land-grant colleges.

19. The evaluative criteria for the acquisition of tenure were not specifically stated in many of the documents from the eighty participating institutions. The most common expression for evaluative criteria was "satisfactory service." Evaluative criteria were specific in the documents from thirty-four institutions. The frequently stated criteria were teaching ability, research ability, professional degree and

and achievement, scholarly publications, and cooperation and general service.

20. Governing procedure for the acquisition of tenure was not prescribed in the documents from thirty-six institutions. In the documents from thirty institutions action was reserved to the administration and in the documents from fourteen institutions provisions were stated for faculty consultation or faculty action although reserving final action for the administration.

21. The teacher's right to appeal from the denial of tenure was recognized in the documents from eleven of the eighty state universities and land-grant colleges.

22. Publications from half of the eighty state universities and land-grant colleges indicated criteria for termination of tenure although many of them stated "cause," "due cause," or "adequate cause," in addition to the specific criteria. Specific criteria for termination of tenure were not indicated in the documents from thirty-two institutions. "Cause," "due cause," or "adequate cause," or "grounds included in the 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure" were stated in these documents. No criterion for the termination of tenure was specified in the documents of eight institutions.

23. The most frequently stated criteria for termination of tenure were misconduct or immorality, professional incompetence, neglect of duty, financial exigencies, and incapacity or disability.

24. Institutional documents of eleven of the eighty state universities and land-grant colleges indicated either "academic due process" or the 1958 "Statement on Procedural Standards in Faculty Dismissals

Proceedings," or both as the accepted principle in procedures for termination of tenure. Procedures for termination of tenure were described in the publications of sixty-three state universities and land-grant colleges.

25. Institutional documents from seventeen state universities and land-grant colleges indicated some kind of procedures for informal adjustment and conciliation of tenure termination cases.

26. Institutional documents from sixty-three state universities and land-grant colleges indicated that a teacher was granted a hearing if he asked for one. Six indicated that the hearing was conducted whether the accused teacher asked for the hearing or not. Eleven institutions did not indicate any specific provisions for the hearing of tenure termination cases.

27. Institutional documents from sixty-three state universities and land-grant colleges indicated that the accused teacher would receive a copy of the charges against him. Institutional documents of eleven state universities and land-grant colleges indicated that the accused teacher would receive in advance a list of the possible witnesses who would testify against him.

28. According to the tenure statements from fifty-six state universities and land-grant colleges, hearings in tenure termination cases were conducted by standing committees at thirty-nine institutions and by special committees at seventeen institutions.

29. Thirty-one of the fifty-six hearing committees were composed of faculty members only, six were composed of members of faculty and administration, four were composed of members of the faculty, administration,

and the governing board, and three of them were constituted in some different manner other than those described above. One of the three was composed of members of the faculty and the governing board, and two were composed of trustees only. Documents of twelve institutions were not specific about the composition of the hearing committee.

30. Institutional documents of twenty-one of the forty-four state universities and land-grant colleges indicated specific procedure for the constitution of hearing committees and documents of twenty-three institutions were not specific about the procedure of the constitution of the hearing committees. At nine state universities and land-grant colleges all members of the hearing committees were appointed either by the president, faculty senate, or governing board of the institution. At thirteen institutions the members of the hearing committee were elected either by the faculty or by the faculty committee. Some members were elected and some were appointed at seven institutions.

31. Institutional documents from eleven institutions, did not indicate specific procedures for tenure termination, but they indicated acceptance of the 1958 Statement on Procedural Standards in Faculty Dismissal Proceedings as guiding principles in tenure termination cases.

32. The teacher's right to be present at the hearing with a counsel of his choice was recognized at fifty-three state universities and land-grant colleges. The teacher's right to introduce and summon witnesses was recognized at thirty-one institutions. The teacher's right to cross examine witnesses was assured at forty-eight institutions. At forty-two institutions the teacher's right to receive a full transcript of the hearing was recognized. The teacher's right to appeal against adverse decisions was assured at thirty-eight institutions.

33. Institutional documents from the thirty-five state universities and land-grant colleges indicated policies for the suspension of accused teacher pending final decision by the hearing committee and the administration when the faculty member's continued presence in the classroom was considered to be clearly harmful to the institution. In most cases the suspension was with full compensation and the usual fringe benefits for the teacher.

34. Institutional documents of eight state universities and land-grant colleges indicated that a teacher whose tenure was terminated for any cause other than moral turpitude (in some cases gross irresponsibility) would receive salary for one year from the date of the notice of termination.

Questionnaire Replies

1. The administrative heads of sixty state universities and land-grant colleges responding to the mail questionnaire reported that during fall 1969 a total of 52,648 faculty members were employed in their institutions. Of this number, 28,870, or 54.8 percent, were tenured teachers. Broken down by rank the following number and percent at each rank were on tenure: 15,242, or 94.3 percent, of the 16,151 professors; 10,220, or 82.8 percent, of 12,329 associate professors; 3,010, or 18.4 percent, of 16,355 assistant professors; 313 or, 5.0 percent, of 6,257 instructors; and 85 or, 5.4 percent, of 1,556 teachers (lecturers and assistant instructors, etc.).

2. The high, low, and median percentage of tenured teachers at the rank of professor were 100.0, 50.0, and 93.1 respectively. The high, low, and median percentage of tenured teachers at the rank of associate

professor were 100.0, 2.0 and 77.3 respectively. The high, low, and median percentage of tenured teachers at the rank of assistant professor were 82.3, 1.0, and 27.6 respectively. The high, low, and median percentage of teachers at the rank of instructor were 65.3, 1.1, and 9.7 respectively. The high, low, and median percentage of the total tenured faculty were 74.2, 6.4, and 51.0 respectively.

3. The percentage range of tenured faculty members at various ranks were as follows: professor, 50.0--100.0; associate professor , 2.0--100.0; assistant professor; 0.0--82.3; instructor, 0.0--65.3, and others, 0.0--26.4.

4. Only fourteen of the sixty state universities and land-grant colleges responding to the mail questionnaire reported tenure termination proceedings during the ten-year period preceding 1968-69. These institutions reported a total of twenty-seven such proceedings. Eighteen institutions reported that data related to tenure termination proceedings and dismissals were not available. Twenty-eight institutions reported no tenure proceedings or dismissals during the ten-year period.

5. Of the fourteen state universities and land-grant colleges reporting twenty-seven dismissals, one institution had five dismissals, one had four dismissals, two had three dismissals each, two had two dismissals each, and eight had one dismissal each during the ten-year period.

6. Nine of the fourteen state universities and land-grant colleges reporting dismissals, reported that they had fourteen dismissals after the hearing of tenure termination cases. Only one institution reported retention of one teacher after a hearing. Only two reported six faculty resignations during the ten-year period.

7. The fourteen state universities and land-grant colleges reporting dismissals indicated immorality or gross misconduct as the cause for six dismissals and various other criteria described as "adequate cause" for twenty-one dismissals.

CONCLUSIONS

The following are the conclusions on the basis of the findings of the study:

1. The tenure policies and procedures of the eighty state universities and land-grant colleges studied vary in degrees of completeness, clarity, and perfection.

2. Tenure plans of eighty state universities and land-grant colleges included in this study are as diverse as is American higher education itself.

3. The comparative analysis of the data concerning policies and procedures for the acquisition and termination of tenure of the eighty state universities and land-grant colleges with those of the previous studies indicate improvement as to completeness in the statement of policies and procedures concerning the acquisition and termination of tenure.

4. The comparison of the findings of this study with those of the previous studies does not indicate any significant change in the ranks at which faculty members are normally eligible for tenure.

5. The comparison of the findings of this study with those of the previous studies does not indicate any significant change in the duration of the probationary period.

6. The higher the academic rank, the larger is the percentage of tenured faculty in the eighty state universities and land-grant colleges

included in this study.

7. The 30 percent of responses indicating "data not available" and the explanation of several administrative officers of the eighty state universities and land-grant colleges indicating their inability to provide information concerning tenure termination proceedings and faculty dismissals highlight a serious deficiency in proper record keeping of tenure termination proceedings and faculty dismissals.

8. The twenty-seven faculty dismissals during the ten-year period reported by fourteen of the sixty state universities and land-grant colleges indicate that tenure termination cases are not frequent in the state universities and land-grant colleges. Neither is the number of dismissals significant in view of the large number of teachers employed at these institutions.

9. The twenty-seven dismissals reported by the fourteen state universities and land-grant colleges indicate that during the ten-year period the dismissal rate was relatively high in six of the fourteen institutions reporting dismissals. They accounted for nineteen or 70 percent of the twenty-seven dismissals which occurred during the ten-year period.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The study was made to ascertain recommendations which should be helpful to the college and university administrators, faculty and others who are concerned with the tenure policies and procedures of colleges and universities. The following recommendations are made on the basis of

the findings and conclusions of the study:

1. That a study of tenure policies and procedures of all senior colleges and universities be conducted and the findings be compared with the findings of this study which was limited to the 106 state universities and land-grant colleges which were members of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges.

2. That each college or university develop efficient record-keeping procedures to compile and store data concerning the acquisition and termination of tenure.

3. That the colleges and universities examine their institutional documents or statements explaining their tenure policies and procedures and evaluate the same considering completeness, clarity, and perfection as the main criteria.

4. That colleges and universities include in their statements on tenure policies and procedures all information of which a teacher should be aware. A suggested format of the document concerning tenure policies and procedures follows:

A SUGGESTED FORMAT FOR A STATEMENT
ON ACADEMIC TENURE POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

1. Definition of Tenure

A college or university should provide a definition of tenure based on its own philosophy of academic freedom and tenure.

2. The Legal Status of Tenure

Tenure may be legal or moral. If the tenure is legally binding

on the faculty and the governing board, that fact should be stated clearly. It should also be made clear if there are prohibitive provisions which would make tenure legally unenforceable. If tenure is merely a moral obligation of the institution, that should be stated.

3. The Nature of Tenure--Automatic or Evaluative

Tenure may be automatic or evaluative. It should be explained if a faculty member could assume tenure upon completion of a specified probationary period and/or promotion to or appointment at a particular rank; or a teacher would be tenured only after a decision is taken by the governing board and a formal communication of that decision is communicated to the teacher.

4. The Pre-tenure Rank

The lowest rank at which a faculty member would normally be eligible for tenure should be stated specifically.

5. Probationary Period

Probationary period may be the same for all ranks, or it may vary according to different ranks. If it varies according to ranks the probationary period for each rank should be specified.

6. Credit for Previous Service

It should be stated whether or not an institution gives credit for a teacher's previous teaching service at another institution or other institutions towards his period of probation. If it does, the number of years acceptable for such credit should be stated.

7. Criteria for the Acquisition of Tenure

The criteria for the acquisition of tenure should be stated specifically. If these are similar to those already mentioned somewhere as the criteria for appointment and promotion of the faculty, a reference should be made to those criteria.

8. Governing Procedure

Governing procedure for the acquisition of tenure should be clear and elaborate. It must include the specific methods of evaluation and recommendation, the role of the department or division chairman, dean of the college or shcool, the faculty, the president, and the governing board in the process of evaluation, recommendation, and in the final action relating to the award or denial of tenure.

9. Standard for Notice of Nonreappointment

Standard for notice of nonreappointment of the untenured teacher should be described clearly indicating the date and manner of such notice.

10. Appeal from Denial of Tenure

If the college or university recongizes the teacher's right to appeal action relative to denial of tenure, procedures for the appeal should be clearly indicated.

11. Criteria for Termination of Tenure

Criteria for termination of tenure should be stated clearly in specific terms.

12. Procedures for Termination of Tenure

Procedures for termination of tenure should be explained under

the following sub-heads: (1) procedure for informal adjustment and conciliation; (2) procedures preliminary to and in preparation for a formal hearing; (3) procedures by which the hearing body is constituted; (4) procedures in formal hearing and subsequent procedure relating to decision and appeal.

STATE UNIVERSITIES AND LAND-GRANT COLLEGES INCLUDED IN THE STUDY

ALABAMA

*Alabama A & M College (1)
*Auburn University (2)
University of Alabama (2)

ALASKA

*University of Alaska (1)

ARIZONA

Arizona State University (2)
*University of Arizona (2)

ARKANSAS

*Agricultural, Mechanical & Normal College
*University of Arkansas (2)

CALIFORNIA

*University of California (1)

COLORADO

*Colorado State University (1)
University of Colorado

CONNECTICUT

*University of Connecticut (1)

DELAWARE

*Delaware State College (3)
*University of Delaware (1)

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

*Federal City College (3)

FLORIDA

*Florida A & M University (1)
Florida State University
*University of Florida (1)

GEORGIA

*Fort Valley State College
Georgia Institute of Technology (1)
*University of Georgia (1)

HAWAII

*University of Hawaii (2)

IDAHO

*University of Idaho (2)

ILLINOIS

Southern Illinois University (3)
*University of Illinois (1)

INDIANA

Indiana University
*Purdue University (2)

IOWA

*Iowa State University (1)
University of Iowa (2)

KANSAS

*Kansas State University (1)
University of Kansas (1)

KENTUCKY

*Kentucky State College (1)
*University of Kentucky (3)

LOUISIANA

*Louisiana State University
*Southern University

MAINE

*University of Maine (2)

---

1 - Both Questionnaire and Document Received
2 - Document only Received
3 - Questionnaire only Received
* - Land-Grant Institutions

MARYLAND

*Maryland State College
*University of Maryland (2)

MASSACHUSETTS

*Massachusetts Institute of Technology (1)
*University of Massachusetts (1)

MICHIGAN

*University of Michigan (1)
*Michigan State University (1)
Wayne State University

MINNESOTA

*University of Minnesota (2)

MISSISSIPPI

*Alcorn A & M College
*Mississippi State University (1)
Univeristy of Mississippi (1)

MISSOURI

*Lincoln University (1)
*University of Missouri (2)

MONTANA

*Montana State University (2)
University of Montana (1)

NEBRASKA

*University of Nebraska (2)

NEVADA

*University of Navada

NEW HAMPSHIRE

*University of New Hampshire (3)

NEW JERSEY

*Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey

NEW MEXICO

*New Mexico State University (1)
University of New Mexico (1)

NEW YORK

City University of New York (2)
*Cornell University (1)
State University of New York (1) at Albany
State University of New York (1) at Binghampton
State University of New York (1) at Buffalo
State University of New York (1) at Stony Brook

NORTH CAROLINA

*North Carolina A & T State (1) University
*North Carolina State University (1)
University of North Carolina (2)
University of North Carolina (2) at Chapel Hill

NORTH DAKOTA

*North Dakota State University (1)
University of North Dakota (1)

OHIO

Kent State University (1)
Miami University (2)
*Ohio State University (3)

OKLAHOMA

*Langston University (1)
*Oklahoma State University (2)
University of Oklahoma (3)

OREGON

*Oregon State University
University of Oregon (1)

---

1 - Both Questionnaire and Document Received
2 - Document only Received
3 - Questionnaire only Received
* - Land-Grant Institutions

PENNSYLVANIA

*Pennsylvania State University (2)

PUERTO RICO

*University of Puerto Rico (1)

RHODE ISLAND

*University of Rhode Island (1)

SOUTH CAROLINA

*Clemson University (1)
*South Carolina State College (3)
University of South Carolina (1)

SOUTH DAKOTA

*South Dakota State University (2)
University of South Dakota (1)

TENNESSEE

*Tennessee A & I University (3)
*University of Tennessee (2)

TEXAS

*Prairie View A & M College (1)
*Texas A & M University (3)
Texas Southern University (1)
Texas Technological College (2)
University of Houston (1)
University of Texas at Austin (1)

UTAH

*Utah State University
Univeristy of Utah (2)

VERMONT

*University of Vermont (1)

VIRGINIA

University of Virginia
*Virginia Polytechnic Institute (2)
Virginia State College (2)

WASHINGTON

University of Washington (2)
*Washington State University

WEST VIRGINIA

*West Virginia Univeristy (1)

WISCONSIN

*The University of Wisconsin (1)
University of Wisconsin
at Madison

WYOMING

*University of Wyoming (2)

---

1 - Both Questionnaire and Document Received
2 - Document only Received
3 - Questionnaire only Received
* - Land-Grant Institutions